EXHIBIT 4

```
53
 1
      item.
 2
                   When we were on break -- can I make
 3
      a comment?
 4
            Q.
                   Perhaps we should go off the
 5
      record.
 6
                   THE WITNESS: Okay, could we.
 7
                   THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
            record at 12 o'clock.
 8
                    (Discussion off the record.)
 9
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the
10
            record, 12:01.
11
      BY MR. REDDY:
12
13
                   Now, I believe you just stated that
14
      the catalog was associated with the specific
15
      item; is that correct?
16
                   Correct.
            Α.
17
                   So the catalog is not associated
            0.
      with the supplier; is that an accurate
18
19
      statement?
20
                   MS. HUGHEY: Objection;
21
            mischaracterizes the witness' testimony.
22
                   The catalog ID is part of the item
23
      master file, period. There is no catalog ID in
24
      the vendor master.
25
                   Now, with respect to the user
            Q.
```

that there was not a prohibition against duplication of either the software or the manuals with respect to the trial version of the software?

MS. HUGHEY: Objection; asked and

MS. HUGHEY: Objection; asked and answered.

- A. Yeah, I think I've already answered that.
 - Q. What was your answer?
- A. My answer is I believe that it was most probable that there was some kind of wording to protect us on that. But I couldn't say for sure unless I had the agreement in front of me.
- Q. If I could return for a moment to Exhibit No. 2, which was I believe the guided tour.
 - A. Okay. Got it.
- Q. And the page which we've been referring to as L 126664. Which were the results from the purchase requisitioning section.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. So if a user selected an item from this list, at this point was there any way that

a user could cross-reference this item with other items in the P.O. Writer database?

MS. HUGHEY: Objection; vague.

- Q. You can answer if you understand the question.
- A. On this screen, they're looking at a list of items that match their search criteria. If they were to select the combination, the ship forward to look for additional information, that's shown on the next page, the 665.

The only way in this version that they could cross-reference is if they chose, as a customer, to implement the user defined fields or to provide additional information in the extended description area as to what a cross-reference might be. So that would strictly be how that particular customer might have chosen to implement the product.

Q. And as we discussed earlier, that additional line information, the user defined fields within the additional line information, was entirely up to the user to enter whatever information they wanted to in those fields; correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. And those user defined fields could not have been searched in the version 10 of the P.O. Writer Plus system; correct?

MS. HUGHEY: Objection;

mischaracterizes the witness' testimony.

A. The user defined fields could not be searched to do an item look up. And to my knowledge, and based on what's in this document, they couldn't be searched in this version.

That's my understanding after looking at this document.

So they were there for reference.

Q. You can set that document aside.

(McEneny Exhibit 5 for identification, document entitled "Tenth Edition," production numbers L 126501 through L 126513.)

MR. REDDY: I've handed a document to be marked as Exhibit No. 5, which is a document Bates labelled L 126501 through 126513. And at the top it states "tenth edition," in parentheses, April 1993.

Q. If you can take a few moments to familiarize yourself with that document.